

08-16-05

IFW

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	10/614,577
Filing Date	July 7, 2003
First Named Inventor	Kent Barker et al.
Art Unit	2839
Examiner Name	Chandrika Prasad
Attorney Docket Number	14254

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation
<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address
<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer
<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund
<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Exhibit A (Petition of Decision) |
|---|--|---|

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Autoliv ASP, Inc.		
Signature			
Printed name	Sally J. Brown		
Date	8/15/05	Reg. No.	37,788

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Vickie Harris	Date	8-16-05

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 10/614,577 Confirmation No.: 2594
Applicant : Kent Barker et al.
Title : ELECTRICAL CONNECTION APPARATUS
AND METHOD FOR AN AIRBAG
INFLATOR
Filed : July 7, 2003
TC/A.U. : 2839
Examiner : Chandrika Prasad
Docket No. : 14254

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO SPECIES ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action of July 15, 2005. In that office action the Examiner purported to enter a species election requirement requiring Applicants to elect from among fifteen (15) different alleged species. However, Applicants submit that this issue has already been decided by the Director in a "Decision on Petition" and the Examiner has been instructed to proceed with examination of the application.

FACTS

This application was filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 7, 2003. In an office action dated June 9, 2004, the Examiner issued a species election requirement requesting that Applicants elect a single species from among fifteen (15) alleged species. Each of the species were closely related and were tied to drawings or groups of drawings submitted in the application.

Applicants objected to the species election requirement. Applicants responded to the species election requirement by filing a "Petition to the Director Under 37 CFR §1.144." In summary, the Applicants pointed out that: (1) the election requirement was unduly burdensome on the Applicants; (2) requiring election between fifteen different groups of alternative features

of the present invention may unnecessarily delay issuance of the claimed subject matter; (3) the election requirement was inequitable because it may significantly increase the monetary burden on the Applicants in prosecuting the claims; and (4) compared to the cost, delay, and burden placed on the Applicants in prosecuting an application having fifteen different groups of species, the additional burden on the Examiner in examining all of the claims at the same time is minimal to non-existent.

In response to the Petition a "Decision on Petition" was issued. *See, attached Exhibit A.* The Decision decided that "Since the disclosed species are closely related, the restriction on that basis is hereby withdrawn." In place of the Species Election Requirement, an "Election / Restriction" requirement was issued requiring Applicants to elect from among four (4) alleged inventions. On June 16, 2005, Applicants submitted a response to the "Election/Restriction Requirement" in which Applicants elected "claim group I, including claims 1-40 and 49-52, drawn to an initiation assembly/inflator, classified in class 439, subclass 352.


Summary

In summary, this case is fully ready for examination. The Decision on Petition decided the issue of the alleged fifteen (15) species finding that they were closely related and that the requirement was withdrawn. Applicants have fully responded to the subsequent Election/Restriction Requirement. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request prompt substantive examination of pending claims 1-40 and 49-52.

Appl. No. 10/614,577
Amdt. dated August 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2005

If there remain any further issues that could be clarified in a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 8/15/05

Autoliv ASP, Inc.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden, Utah 84405
Telephone: (801) 625-4994